

Minutes of the OC Executive Board

2 November 1976

The following members were in attendance:



25X1

AGENDA ITEM #1 - Centralized OC Planning?



the OC Planning Officer with a direct reporting channel to the D/CO. At the time the work load of the Deputy occupied about half of the available time. Due to rather rapid rotation through the position and the change in work load, the function was never carried out. The subject of centralized OC planning needs now to be reconsidered. Comment and discussion was requested.

2. Discussion covered the existing OC planning system; definition of the planning function; possible roles and command relationships; and various possibilities for organizational location of a planner or planning staff. It was generally conceded that the planning function as now carried out is too fragmented and too closely related to individual internal organizational component objectives and programs/projects and to the budgeting cycle. Central OC planning should be undertaken to assist the D/CO with formulation and planning for achieving D/CO objectives and goals over a much longer period than is encompassed by the budget/program cycle. Central planning should be undertaken

E3 IMPDET  
CL BY

25X1

SUBJECT: Minutes of OC Executive Board - 2 November 1976

on a full time basis and planners should have a close and significant relationship to the D/CO and be free of conflicting day-to-day duties, problems and command relationships. Central planning should be concentrated on establishing over-all office objectives and goals for a period of about the following 10 to 15 years. Determination of customer requirements is a function for the Operations Staff. Formulation of long range office objectives and systems plans for satisfying the requirements is a proper function of a planning group. Programming specific methods to meet the objectives and goals and execution of the programs are functions to be performed by the services. It was agreed that a planning function should remain within individual components but that component planning should be largely concentrated on the program period. There was also some discussion on the number of personnel needed in the Office Planning Staff.

25X1 3. Mr. [ ] summed up the conclusion that there should be centralized OC planning. The planning component is to be consolidated with, and located in, the Programs and Budget Staff for administration. The Ceiling Board is responsible for the next action--recommending the number and grade levels of appropriate personnel available for assignment to P&B (one or more as resources allow). The grade level should be at the GS-12 to GS-14 range if possible.

AGENDA ITEM #2 - Comcenter Nomenclature and CATRAN

25X1 1. Mr. [ ] suggested that this item be removed from the agenda and deferred to Operations. Mr. [ ] mentioned that the problem was of increasing concern as various investigators are questioning terminology and the method of describing various station relationships and the effect on results of counting messages as an accurate indication of work load. 25X1 Mr. [ ] mentioned that eight different categories of stations had been identified so far and that commonality was not as great as had been thought. Resolution of the problem should be deferred for further investigation.

2. The Board voted unanimously to refer the problem to Operations and P&B for a recommended solution.

SUBJECT: Minutes of OC Executive Board - 2 November 1976

AGENDA ITEM #3 - Results of the Study on the Suggestion  
For Improving the Competitive Evaluation  
System (See Minutes of 7 September  
Meeting.)

25X1 1. Mr. [ ] introduced this item with a question to  
25X1 Mr. [ ] as to whether the Services paper was based on  
a recommendation to implement the suggestion for Panel T  
personnel at grade GS-09. Mr. [ ] affirmed that the 25X1  
paper was based upon such a recommendation. He further  
recommended adoption of method B - designating a specific  
minimum number of promotions annually, e.g., 20 designations  
regardless of carry-over "lock-ins" from the prior year.

2. In the considerable discussion which followed, several  
points were covered--should promotion sequence be by date of  
grade or by ranking on the CCEL; the appropriateness of the  
number to be promoted annually or whether a number or per cent  
for carry-over should be selected; whether the procedure should  
be "gamed" prior to implementation; etc. There was general  
agreement that although the number 20 was not necessarily  
perfect, it appeared reasonable in view of past experience.  
There was considerable discussion on the sequence of promotion  
from the "designated for promotion" list. It was pointed out  
that promotion sequence based on date of grade would be contrary  
to merit system principles. Mr. [ ] made the point that 25X1  
whatever method is adopted, it should be easily understandable,  
simple in application, as free as possible from change and  
must not be, or appear to be, subject to manipulation. He  
also mentioned, and it was agreed, that we are too close to  
this year's competitive evaluation time to "game" the proposal  
and still implement it during the upcoming evaluation cycle.  
25X1 Mr. [ ] mentioned that adoption of some form of "designated  
for promotion" system should help reduce the sawtooth effect and  
demonstrate management concern for our people without seriously  
distorting our competitive system. Mr. [ ] suggested 25X1  
that we should get Area Chief reaction prior to adoption.

25X1 3. Mr. [ ] summed up the conclusions. We should adopt  
some version of a "designated for promotion" system and it  
should be close to version B of the Services proposal. The  
proposed system should be written up and sent to Area Chiefs  
for evaluation and simultaneously "gamed." The "gaming"  
should be conducted during a relatively short time and cover

SUBJECT: Minutes of OC Executive Board - 2 November 1976

three or four assumptions on headroom. The "gaming" should lead to conclusions as to what the effect of adoption would be over the next five years under situations ranging from headroom limits of ten to fifteen annual promotions to as much as a 50% upgrade of positions. Neither the method of handling "carry-overs" nor promotion sequence by date of grade or competitive sequence should be covered in the dispatch to the Area Chiefs. The Board will meet later on the subject and at that time will make decisions based on Area Chief input and results of the "gaming."

25X1

Secretary,  
OC Executive Board

APPROVED:

Director of Communications

11-8-76  
Date

Distribution:

1 - Each Board Member